

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT  
(Butte)

----

THE PEOPLE,  
  
Plaintiff and Respondent,  
  
v.  
  
MARK ALLEN SEATON,  
  
Defendant and Appellant.

C060672  
  
(Super. Ct. No.  
CM027584)

In October 2007, a legal typist for the Butte County Department of Children's Services sent defendant Mark Allen Seaton a notice of hearing regarding his alleged son's dependency case.<sup>1</sup> Two weeks later, defendant sent the typist a letter containing death threats against her. The letter caused the typist to fear for herself and her family. On or around the same day, defendant telephoned Children's Services and left a message in which he threatened to sue the agency for harassment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because the matter was resolved by plea, our statement of facts is taken from the probation officer's report.

Defendant pled no contest to threatening to commit a crime that would result in death or great bodily injury. (Pen. Code, § 422; further statutory references are to the Penal Code.) He was sentenced to state prison for three years, awarded 394 days' custody credit and 144 days' conduct credit, and ordered to make restitution to the victim and pay a \$200 restitution fine (§ 1202.4, subd. (b)), a \$200 restitution fine suspended unless parole is revoked (§ 1202.45), and a \$20 court security fee (§ 1465.8).

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and requests this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from defendant. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

#### DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

We concur: \_\_\_\_\_, J.  
NICHOLSON

\_\_\_\_\_ , P. J.  
SCOTLAND

\_\_\_\_\_ , J.  
ROBIE